

| | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/665,410 | DESHMUKH ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Paul A. Zucker | 1621 |

All Participants:

(1) Paul A. Zucker.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) Larry S. Nixon.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 March 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called Mr. Nixon to indicate that the application was almost in condition for allowance except that the limitation "method" in line 8 of claim 1 appeared to be the result of a clerical error and should be changed to "metal" instead. Mr. Nixon agreed to authorize the following change by Examiner's Amendment:

The claims have been amended as follows:

Claim 1, line 8: The word [method] has been deleted and replaced with the word -- metal --.